

vided that her goods should be forfeited and herself banished the king-dona if she afterwards returned to Court. She did return to Court, and the sentence was consequently executed by the Parliament of October 1377, but not by the Good Parliament, as Bishop Stubbs might lead people to suppose.

*Note 2, p. 30*

I agree with Bishop Stubbs (ii. 452, note 6) that although the Bolls of Parliament put the sections referring to the formation of this Council *before* the sections referring to the impeachments, it is probable that the distinct statement of the *Chronicon Anglice* is to be preferred. That chronicle, which gives a very detailed account of every step of the proceedings of this Parliament, says, after describing the affair of Alice Perrers, \* His ita se habentibus, cum jam finis Parliament! instaret, milites petierunt ut duodecim dornini regis consiliis assiderent,' &c. The Rolls of Parliament are, it must be remembered, no evidence of chronological order, for they arrange then\* matter in order of class of subject, not in order of time. Thus they record the grant of money, which was in this Parliament carefully deferred to the end of all, before any other business, even before the first refusal of the Commons to make the grant.

It is true that an MS. from Stowe's collection, printed at the beginning of *Chron. Ang.* (R.S.) p. lxxi, puts the election of the Council at the beginning of Parliament, and makes the new councilDors the judgea of -the impeached peers. But the MS. is without date or parentage, a mere scrap without beginning or ending, and cannot be put up against the detailed account of the Good Parliament, given by such an authority as thQ, *Chronicon AnglicB.* Besides, the Bolls of Parliament make it clear that the impeached were not tried before a select committee. The other MS. of a similar character, printed at the beginning of *Chron. Ang*^ p. lxxviii, gives the names of the councillors, but does not clearly state at what period of Parliament they were elected.

*Note 2, p. 34*

The trial of the most damaging charges appears to have been broken off. It does not therefore follow that Wykeham was necessarily innocent on these heads. There may have been reasons for the suspension of the trial other than the weakness of the case against the prisoner. The historical evidence is very obscure, and does not render clear either the exact procedure or the political forces behind the curtain. I have been all along well acquainted with Mr. Moberly's *Life of WyTeeham*, but I cannot feel so certain as he does that we have the whole truth of the story.

*Note 2, p. 88*

Wale., i. 825, states that the Pope issued bulls for WycliffeVarrest before this trial, but this statement is incorrect. The bulls are dated May 31,